

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/878,187	06/12/2001	Toshio Morita	Q61610	1960
7590 12/30/2003 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			LISH, PETER J	
	DC 20037-3213		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1754	
•				
			1754	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/878,187	MORITA ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit			
		Peter J Lish	1754			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sh t with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SH THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE!	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C.§ 133).			
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 C</u>	October 2003.				
•	<u> </u>	action is non-final.				
3)□	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 13.15 and 16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 13 and 15-16 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
•		r election requirement.				
Application Papers						
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine		Evaminer			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
* S 13)⊠ A Si 3 a 14)□ A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestince a specific reference was included in the first 7 CFR 1.78.  1) The translation of the foreign language process of the company of the	is have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). In of the certified copies not received in priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) st sentence of the specification or povisional application has been received in priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120	on No  ed in this National Stage  ed.  e) (to a provisional application)  in an Application Data Sheet.  eived.  and/or 121 since a specific			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)						
2) Notic	re of References Cited (PTO-892) re of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	5) D Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/878,187

Art Unit: 1754

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's arguments, with respect to the rejection of claims 13-15 over prior art to Tamura et al. and to Hiraoka et al. have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 13-15 as unpatentable over these references has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 13-15 over prior art to Kyotani et al., Tennent et al., and Harada et al. have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejection over Kyotani et al., applicant argues that Kyotani does not explicitly teach the degree of crystallinity of the fibers, assumedly arguing that the fibers of Kyotani et al. are not graphitized. However, it is expected that the fibers of Kyotani et al. be graphitized due to the heat treatment at 2800 °C, a process that is known to graphitize carbon. Applicants additionally argue that the process of producing the fibers of Kyotani does not use a catalyst material, however, it is held that the method of production does not limit the material itself. No difference is seen between the carbon fibers of Kyotani et al. and those of the instantly claimed invention. Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. See In re Best, 195 USPQ 430.

Regarding the rejection over Tennent et al., the vapor-grown carbon fibers discussed in column 2 are those used in the rejection. Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to prove that the

Application/Control Number: 09/878,187

Art Unit: 1754

prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. See In re Best, 195 USPQ 430.

Regarding the rejections over Harada et al., applicant argues that the comparative example in the specification of the instant application proves that high-temperature heat treatment performed other than by the method of example 1 results in a metal content of greater than 100 ppm. First, this is assuming the same initial concentration of metal. Second, the comparative example also recites the destruction of the furnace in which the high-temperature heating takes place. It is expected that this not occur in the process of Harada et al., as no mention is made to it. Therefore, the comparative example cannot be relied upon to determine the amount of metal impurity in the carbon fibers of Harada et al. No difference is seen between the carbon fibers of Harada et al. and those of the instantly claimed invention. Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. See In re Best, 195 USPQ 430.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

Claims 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kyotani et al. ("Preparation of Ultrafine Carbon Tubes...").

Application/Control Number: 09/878,187

Art Unit: 1754

The rejection of the previous office action is maintained in its entirety and incorporated herein by reference.

Claims 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tennent et al. (USPN 6,235,674).

The rejection of the previous office action is maintained in its entirety and incorporated herein by reference.

Claims 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Harada et al. (USPN 5,409,775).

The rejection of the previous office action is maintained in its entirety and incorporated herein by reference.

## Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1754

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Lish whose telephone number is 571-272-1354. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-6:00 Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

PL

STUART L. HENDRICKSON PRIMARY EXAMINER